Office Supreme Court, U.
FILED
SEP 13 1928
CHARLES ELMORE CROP
CLER

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1928

No. 763 64

ALBERT S. WILLIAMS, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Tennessee, L. D. SMITH, Attorney General of the State of Tennessee, and R. M. ATKINSON, District Attorney General,

APPELLANTS,

Against

STANDARD OIL COMPANY OF LOUISIANA,

APPELLEE.

On Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Brief and Argument on Behalf of Appellants, Officials of the State of Tennessee.

L. D. SMITH,
Attorney General of Tennessee.

H. N. LEECH,
J. J. LYNCH,
CHAS. T. CATES, JR.,
Attorneys for Appellants.

McQUIDDY PRINTING CO., NASHVILLE

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1928

No. 763

ALBERT S. WILLIAMS, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Tennessee, L. D. SMITH, Attorney General of the State of Tennessee, and R. M. ATKINSON, District Attorney General,

APPELLANTS,

Against

STANDARD OIL COMPANY OF LOUISIANA,

APPELLEE.

On Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Brief and Argument on Behalf of Appellants, Officials of the State of Tennessee.

L. D. SMITH,
Attorney General of Tennessee.

H. N. LEECH,
J. J. LYNCH,
CHAS. T. CATES, JR.,
Attorneys for Appellants.

McQUIDDY PRINTING CO., NASHVILLE

SUBJECT INDEX.

	PAGE
I. TWO VITAL QUESTIONS DECIDED AGAINST THE STATE OF TENNESSEE BY THE DISTRICT COURT	1- 2
1. That the State of Tennessee is without power to regulate the price of gasoline sold within her borders, so as to allow dealers in gasoline to exact only reasonable prices therefor	1
2. That the State is without power to require a foreign corporation, as a condition of its doing business within the State, to furnish information in regard to the conduct of its business within the State	2
II. HISTORY OF THE CASE	2-19
1. Price war, rebates and discriminations in the gasoline industry in Tennessee	2- 3
2. Governor's Message to the General Assembly recommending regulatory legislation	3- 4
3. Legislation complained of and held invalid by the District Court	4- 5 63-71
4. Original Injunction Bill filed challenging constitutionality of the Act	5- 6
5. Answer and motion to dismiss the bill	6-15
(1) Motion to dismiss upon the ground that the Act challenged is a valid, constitutional enactment of the State of Tennessee	6- 7
(2) Answer of defendants in the Court below	7-15
(a) The Standard Oil Company of Louisiana, complainant in the original bill, appellee in this Court, is, in effect, the same corporate interest as the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky which was ousted from doing business in the State of Tennessee by decree of Supreme Court of that State, affirmed by this Court	7-11

PAGE

(b) The gasoline industry in Tennessee is affected with, and has been devoted to a public use and, therefore, is subject to the regulatory police power of the State..... 11-15

(c) The gasoline industry in Tennessee is monopolized and controlled by the principal dealers in said State, and is, therefore, subject to the regulatory police power of the State... 11-15

6. Amendment to bill charging that the officials of Tennessee were about to institute prosecutions for each and every violation of said Act 15

7. Amendment to answer of Tennessee officials, denying allegations of amendment to the bill, and stating that it was not the intention of said officials to attempt to enforce said Act until it had been construed and held valid by the Court 15-16

8. Opinion and Decree of the District Court.. 16-17

(1) That because of threatened prosecutions, complainant in the Court below was entitled to an injunction..... 17

(2) That the price-fixing provisions of the Act are invalid..... 17

(3) That the price-fixing provisions constituted the main purpose of the Act, and that therefore the whole Act was void..... 17

(4) And the Court so decreed..... 17

9. Substitution of Commissioner of Finance and Taxation, Williams, successor in office of F. S. Hall, one of the original defendants, and an appeal prayed and granted..... 17-18

III. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR..... 18-19

1. The District Court erred in holding that the Act of 1927 challenged by the bill was unconstitutional because said Act is a valid and proper exercise of the police power of the State, in its declared purpose to prevent monopoly and extortion in the prices of gasoline 18

PAGE

2. That the Act is a valid and proper regulation of the gasoline industry in Tennessee, because said industry is affected with a public interest 18

3. That the Act challenged is within the just and reserved police powers of the State to regulate and fix prices for the sale and distribution within the State, of gasoline,—a commodity affected with and devoted to the public interest 18

4. That even if the price-fixing provisions of the Act should be held invalid, the other regulatory provisions of the Act, intended to remedy the evils recited and set forth in the Act, are severable from the body of the Act and should be sustained 18-19

5. No injunction should have been issued because the Oil Companies had a plain, adequate and complete remedy at law.

IV. PROPOSITIONS OF LAW 19-42

1. The Standard Oil Company of Louisiana, in respect of their intra-state business in Tennessee, is, in fact and in law, the same interests represented by the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky, ousted from doing business in said State, and is not lawfully entitled to carry on its business therein or to complain of the Act of 1927 19-20

Cases sustaining said proposition of law 20

2. A foreign corporation is not entitled to carry on its business in any state except by complying with the conditions prescribed by such state 20-22

Cases sustaining said proposition of law 20-22

3. Courts take cognizance of all matters of general knowledge, and may make use of its knowledge of facts with which they have become familiar by a series of preceding cases .. 22-23

Cases sustaining said proposition of law 22-23

PAGE

4. Every presumption and reasonable intendment is in favor of the constitutionality of the Act 23-25

(a) Brown vs. Maryland, 12 Wheat, 436.. 23

(b) Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U. S., 718..... 23

(c) Arizona Copper Co. vs. Hammer, 250 U. S., 400..... 24

(d) Knoxville vs. Knoxville Water Co., 212 U. S., 8..... 24

(e) Adkins vs. Children's Hospital, 261 U. S., 525, 544..... 25

Other cases sustaining said proposition of law 25

5. Upon the facts disclosed in the record the gasoline industry in Tennessee has been devoted to and is clothed with a public interest, and the legislation complained of was enacted in the proper exercise of the police power of the state 25-26

Cases sustaining said proposition of law..... 25-26

V. ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE FIFTH PROPOSITION OF LAW, SUPRA..... 26-42

1. To what does the police power of the State extend?—It has never been limited by express definition 26-30

(a) Cooley on Constitutional Limitations.. 26

(b) People vs. Budd, 117 N. Y., 1..... 26-27

(c) Tennessee cases supporting the doctrine that the police power extends to the safety, health, morals, comfort, and welfare of the people, and expands to meet new conditions..... 27-28

(d) Federal cases supporting the doctrine above stated 28-30

In Re: Rahrer, 140 U. S., 554..... 28

Wolff vs. Industrial Court, 262 U. S., 522.... 29

German Alliance Insurance Co. vs. Lewis, 233 U. S., 389, 91-410..... 29

PAGE

Rail & River Co. vs. Yappel, 236 U. S., 338... 29

Central Lumber Co. vs. South Dakota, 226 U. S., 157, 161..... 30

2. Facts relied upon showing that the gasoline industry is clothed with a public interest are not denied by appellee, complainant in the Court below 30

3. Summary of facts and conditions showing that the gasoline industry is a monopoly in Tennessee and has been devoted to, and is affected with a public interest..... 30-35

(1) Matters of common knowledge of which this Court takes cognizance..... 30-32

(a) Mennen Co. vs. Federal Trade Commission, Fed. Rep., 774, 778, 779, reviewing illegal practices of corporations, such as the Standard Oil Company and its subsidiaries, in monopolizing and controlling prices..... 31-32

(2) The judicial history of the petroleum industry showing, as portrayed by the decisions of the State and Federal Courts, an unrelenting and unswerving determination on the part of the Standard Oil Companies to monopolize and control the entire industry in this country.... 32-33

(3) Dealers in gasoline in Tennessee have, in fact, a monopoly of that business, and facts supporting this proposition..... 33-34

(4) Ouster from the State under the anti-trust Acts enforced against the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky, did not and does not give relief to the people of Tennessee,—hence the additional reason for controlling prices of gasoline,—giving a fair price to the dealer, and a reasonable and fair price to the seller... 34-35

(a) Report of Manufacturers' Committee of United States Senate to the effect that gasoline is essential to the life of industry and vital to the public,—that it is affected with a public interest and subject to regulations..... 35

PAGE

4. The Tennessee Act challenged by the Standard Oil Company and other Oil Companies in Tennessee is sustained by the decisions of this Court as a valid exercise of the state's police power 36-42

(a) The case of Tyson vs. Banton, 264 U. S., 140, upon which the learned District Court predicated its holding, and the case of Fairmont Creamery Co. vs. Minnesota, 274 U. S., 1, and Ribnik vs. McBride, decided by this Court on May 28, 1928, relied upon by appellee, cited and distinguished from the facts and principle controlling in this case 36-37

(b) The principles announced and enforced in the Munn case (94 U. S., 113), and Wolff case (262 U. S., 522), predicated in a large measure upon the Allnut case (12 East, 527), sustains the Tennessee Act upon the grounds:

(1) The gasoline industry in Tennessee has been carried on and is being carried on in such a manner as makes it of utmost public consequence affecting the community 37-38

(2) Dealers in the gasoline industry without a grant or governmental franchise, have a virtual monopoly of the sale and distribution of gasoline in Tennessee 37-42

5. The Munn case is the guide-post 37-38

(a) Allnut vs. Inglis, 12 East, 527, upon which the Munn case is largely predicated 38-39

(b) The Wolff case,—its classifications of the businesses clothed with a public interest 39-41

(c) The Van Dyke case (244 U. S., 39), following the Munn case, approvingly quotes:

"Property becomes clothed with a public interest when used in a manner

PAGE

to make it of public consequence and to affect the community at large."

6. Proposition of law as follows:

Even if the price-fixing features of the Act complained of are held to be invalid, nevertheless the other regulatory features of the Act are valid, and should be sustained, as insisted, in the fourth assignment of error 42

(1) Opinion of the District Court to the effect that the other regulatory features of the Act fall with the price-fixing provisions 42-43

(2) Argument in support of the fourth assignment of error 43-60

(a) The price-fixing provisions of the Act are but one of the remedies against the evils complained of as set forth in the bill, and it is manifest that the Legislature intended to assert its power to fully regulate the gasoline industry by means and methods in addition to those included within the price-fixing provisions 43

(b) Some of the severable provisions of the Act analyzed, especially those relating to the collection of data and furnishing information 43-60

(c) Application of the principle announced in Standard Oil Company vs. State, 217 U. S., 817, and the anti-trust Act of 1903 to the conditions sought to be remedied by the Challenged Act 44-45

(d) The case of Weller vs. New York, 268 U. S., 319-322, construing the same statute of New York involved in the Tyson case, supra, sustains the severable provisions of the Tennessee Act 45-49

(e) The cases of Hall vs. Geiger, 242 U. S., 538; Caldwell vs. Sioux Falls Co., 242 U. S., 558, and Merrick vs. Halsey, 242

PAGE

U. S., 568, sustaining the Blue Sky Laws of Ohio, South Dakota and Michigan, sustains the principle and doctrine contended for in the Tennessee Act..... 49-51

7. The provisions of the Tennessee Act prohibiting rebating and discrimination are valid, and are sustained by the decisions of this Court 51-59

(1) Section of the Tennessee Act prohibiting rebating and discrimination..... 52

Sustained by the following decisions of this Court:

Standard Oil case, 221 U. S., 1; Missouri Standard Oil case, 224 U. S., 761; Nash vs. United States, 259 U. S., 273,

(2) It was for the offense denounced by said Section of the Tennessee Act that the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky representing the same interest as does appellee, was ousted from Tennessee, as hereinbefore shown,—the decree of ouster being affirmed by this Court... 52

(a) Central Lumber Co. vs. South Dakota, 226 U. S., 157..... 53-55

(b) Fairmont Creamery Co. vs. Montana, 274 U. S., 1-11 analyzed..... 55-56

(c) Crescent Cotton Oil Co. vs. Miss., 257 U. S., 129, analyzed and applied to this case 57-58

(d) Purity Extract Co. vs. Lynch, 226 U. S., 197, analyzed and applied to this case. 58-59

(e) Other severable provisions relating to differentials 60-61

CONCLUSION 61-62

APPENDIX,—Copy of Tennessee Act..... 63-71

INDEX OF CASES CITED.

	PAGE
Adkins vs. Children's Hospital, 261 U. S., 525, 544	25
Ah Sin vs. Wittman, 198 U. S., 500, 504	59
Allnut vs. Inglis, 12 East., 527, 539-42	25, 38
American Sugar Refining Co. vs. Louisiana, 179 U. S., 89	21, 58
Arizona Copper Co. vs. Hammer, 250 U. S., 400 (63 L. Ed. 1058)	24
Austin vs. State, 110 Tenn., 563, 566	22
Baltic Mining Co. vs. Massachusetts, 231 U. S., 68, 83	20, 21, 57
Beal vs. Chase, 31 Mich., 490	20
Black vs. Hirsch, 256 U. S., 135	40
Booth vs. Illinois, 184 U. S., 425	59
Brown vs. Maryland, 12 Wheaton, 436	23
Brass vs. North Dakota, 153 U. S., 391	25
Brass vs. Stoeser, 153 U. S., 391	40
Brazee vs. Michigan, 241 U. S., 240	47
Budd vs. New York, 143 U. S., 517, affirming 117 N. Y., 1	25, 40
Caldwell vs. Sioux Co., 242 U. S., 558	20, 49
Cargill Co. vs. Minnesota, 180 U. S., 452	21, 58
Central Lumber Co. vs. South Dakota, 226 U. S., 157, 161	30, 53
C. B. & Q. R. R. Co. vs. McGuire, 219 U. S., 549 (55 L. Ed., 328)	29, 54
Crescent Oil Co vs. Mississippi, 257 U. S., 129	20, 21, 57
Dayton Coal, Iron, etc. Co. vs. Boston, 183 U. S., 23 (s.c. 103 Tenn., 604)	26, 27
Dillard & Coffin Co. vs. Richmond Oil Co., 140 Tenn., 298	20
Fairmont Creamery Co. vs. Minnesota, 274 U. S., 1	36, 55
Fort Smith Lumber Co. vs. Arkansas, 251 U. S., 532	21, 58
German Alliance Insurance Co. vs. Lewis, 233 U. S., 389-91, 410, 411, 415-17	25, 29, 40
Green vs. Frazier, 253 U. S., 233	25

PAGE

Grenada Lumber Co. vs. Mississippi, 217 U. S., 433, 442 54
Hall vs. Geiger, 242 U. S., 539 ..... 20, 49
Hammond Packing Co. vs. Arkansas, 212 U. S., 332, 343, 344 ..... 21, 57
Hannibal R. R. Co. vs. Husen, 95 U. S., 465..... 27
Honolulu Rapid Transit & Land Co. vs. Hawaii, 211 U. S., 282 24
Horn Silver Mining Co. vs. New York, 143 U. S., 305 20, 57
In re Rahrer, 140 U. S., 554 28
Jamison vs. Independant Natural Gas Co., 127 Indiana, 555 22
Knight vs. U. S. Land Association, 142 U. S., 161... 22
Knoxville Iron Co. vs. Harbison, 183 U. S., 13 (s.c. 103 Tenn., 421) 25, 27
Knoxville vs. Knoxville Water Co., 212 U. S., 8..... 24, 27
Leeper vs. State, 103 Tenn., 500, 532 ..... 26, 27
Lemeiux vs. Young, 211 U. S., 489, 496 55
LePage Co. vs. Russia Cement Co., 51 Fed. Rep., 941 20
Lindsley vs. Natural Carbonic Gas Co., 220 U. S., 61 58
McGaskill vs. U. S., 216 U. S., 516..... 20
McLean vs. Arkansas, 211 U. S., 539 ..... 25, 29
Manufacturing Co. vs. Falls, 90 Tenn., 466..... 25
Mayor of New York vs. Miln, 11 Peters (U. S.), 139 27
Mennen Co. vs. Federal Trade Commission, 288 Fed. Rep., 774, 778, 779 31
Merrick vs. Halsey, 242 U. S., 569 .....20, 49, 55
Middleton vs. Texas Power, etc. Co., 249 U. S., 152.. 25
Mt. Timber Co. vs. Washington, 243 U. S., 219..... 25
Muller vs. Oregon, 208 U. S., 412..... 22, 23
Munn vs. Illinois, 94 U. S., 113-154.....25, 37, 40, 41
Murphy vs. California, 225 U. S., 623..... 59
Nash vs. U. S., 259 U. S., 273 52
New York, ex rel. Silz vs. Hesterburg, 211 U. S., 31 59
Noble State Bank vs. Haskell, 219 U. S., 104..... 40
Oklahoma Gin Co. vs. State, 252 U. S., 339..... 25
Oklahoma Natural Gas Co. vs. Oklahoma, 258 U. S., 234, 237, 239 25
Oklahoma Operating Co. vs. Love, 252 U. S., 331.... 25
Otis vs. Parker, 187 U. S., 606-9 ..... 55, 59

PAGE
People vs. Budd, 117 N. Y., 1 ..... 26, 40
People of N. Y. vs. North River Sugar Refining Co., 121 N. Y., 582, 9 L. R. A., 33 20
Prentis vs. Southern Railroad Co., 211 U. S., 210... 24
Purity Extract Co. vs. Lynch, 226 U. S., 197..... 55, 58
Railroad vs. Byrne, 119 Tenn., 278, 291, 292..... 25
Rail & River Co. vs. Yappel, 236 U. S., 338 ..... 25, 29
Rast vs. Van Denman, 240 U. S., 342-358..... 58
Ribnik vs. McBride (U. S.), decided 5-28-28..... 36
Richardson vs. Young, 122 Tenn., 471, 522-24..... 49
Sallee vs. Dalton, 213 S. W., 762..... 49
Schallenberger vs. Pennsylvania, 171 U. S., 1..... 22
Shmidinger vs. Chicago, 226 U. S., 578, 57 L. Ed., 364 29
Shea vs. Mining Co., 55 Montana, 522 49
Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U. S., 718 23
Smith vs. State, 16 Pickle (100 Tenn.), 505 28
Sparrow vs. Strong, 3 Wallace, 97, 104 22
Spring Valley Water Co. vs. Schettler, 110 U. S., 347 40
Stafford vs. Wallace, 258 U. S., 495..... 25
Standard Oil Co. vs. U. S., 211 U. S., 1..... 32
Standard Oil Co. vs. State, 117 Tenn., 618..... 32
Standard Oil Co. vs. Missouri, 224 U. S., 761..... 32, 52
Standard Oil Co. vs. State, 217 U. S., 817.....32, 34, 44
Standard Oil Co. of N. J. vs. U. S., 221 U. S., 1.... 33, 52
Standard Oil Co. vs. State, 107 Miss., 227 32
State vs. Edwards, 86 Mo., 102 39
State vs. Standard Oil Co., 173 Fed., 177..... 52
State vs. Fairmount Creamery Co., 153 Iowa, 702, 42 L. R. A. (N. S.), 821 54
State vs. Bridgman & R. Co., 117 Minn., 186..... 54
State vs. Drayton, 82 Neb., 254, 23 L. R. A. (N. S.), 1287 54
State, ex rel Young vs. Standard Oil Co., 111 Minn., 85 54
State vs. Trewhitt, 113 Tenn., 561, 572 49
State vs. Wilson, 101 Kansas, 789, 806 49
State vs. Howitt, 107 Kansas, 423 48
State, ex rel. Watson, vs. Standard Oil Co., 49 Ohio, 137, 15 L. R. A., 156 20
State vs. Standard Oil Co., 120 Tenn., 86 .....32, 34, 52

PAGE

State vs. Standard Oil Co., 218 Mo., 1 32
State vs. Standard Oil Co., 49 Ohio State, 137, 15 L. R. A., 145 32
State, ex rel. vs. Brewing Co., 104 Tenn., 715, 740.. 25
Stone vs. Mississippi, 101 U. S., 814..... 27
Terminal Taxicab Co. vs. District of Columbia, 241 U. S., 251, 254 39
Towles & Co. vs. Miles, 131 Tenn., 79 20
Tyson vs. Banton, 264 U. S., 140 .....36, 45, 47
U. S. vs. Teschmaker, 22 Howard, 392 22
Van Dyke vs. Geary, 244 U. S., 39, 47 ..... 40, 41
Waters Pierce Oil Co. vs. Texas, 212 U. S., 86..... 32
Weller vs. New York, 268 U. S., 319, 322..... 45, 47
Williams vs. Fears, 179 U. S., 270, 276 21
Wolff Packing Co. vs. Court of Industrial Relations, 262 U. S., 522, 535, 536, 538-41 .....25, 29, 39, 40, 41, 48
Yeiser vs. Dysart, 267 U. S., 538 20

TEXT BOOKS CITED

Cook on Corporations, 6 Ed., Sec. 709 20
Cooley on Constitutional Limitations, p. 707..... 20
Morowitz on Private Corp., Sec. 227 20

STATUTES CITED

Public Acts of Tennessee for 1903, Ch. 140 44
Public Acts of Tennessee for 1927, Ch. 22 63